



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,387	10/22/2001	William H. Ward JR.	37100.00084 Div	6385

7590 01/21/2003

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
14th Fl.
801 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

CROSLAND, DONNIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2632

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,387

Applicant(s)

WARD, WILLIAM H.

Examiner

DONNIE L. CROSLAND

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 23-41 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6307468. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the skill artisan recognizes the use of the interrogator in the Patent in a radio frequency identification system (RFID) since RFID systems are conventional.

The skilled artisan recognizes that the claims of the Patent are clearly within the scope of radio frequency transmissions, for instance the recitation of carrier frequency in claim 5 would suggest radio frequency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 41 depends from itself and is accordingly incomplete.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 23-25, 27, and 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balch et al, cited by applicant.

Balch shows a radio frequency identification system interrogation system and includes a first antenna L12 adapted to generate a first magnetic field component having a first phase; a second antenna L14 adapted to generate a second magnetic field component having a second phase; a driver circuit 80 (col. 7, lines coupled to the first and second antennas to provide at least one signal to cause the generation of first

Art Unit: 2632

and second magnetic field components, (col. 3, lines 26 et seq.); whereby the first and second magnetic fields form a time varying composite magnetic field (characteristic response, col. 2, lines 60 et seq.).

It is noted that Balch does not reference a time varying composite magnetic field.

The skilled artisan recognizes that the alternately generation of pulsed magnetic field phases is clearly analogous to the claimed composite magnetic fields.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to equate the claimed magnetic field component or composite magnetic field with the reference pulsed magnetic fields and the characteristic response.

Balch suggests a composite signal on line 97, col. 8, lines 25-32.

With respect to claim 27, note capacitors CR 12 and CR14.

With respect to claims 31 and 32, note alarm indicator in col. 8, lines 35-38.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balch et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Hess, Jr. et al.

Hess shows an interrogator and provides for exciting first and second magnetic fields at a first frequency for generating a composite magnetic field which rotates, see the abstract, col. 5, lines 1-17, col. 6, lines 6-31.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a composite magnetic field, which rotates in the interrogator system of Balch since the use of a composite magnetic field, which rotates in an interrogation system, is clearly suggested by Hess.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 41 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 26, 28-30, 33-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cooper, Gallagher, III et al, and Copeland et al show related rfid (radio frequency identification devices.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DONNIE L. CROSLAND whose telephone number is (703) 305-4388. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9:30a-6:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wu Daniel can be reached on (703) 308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-9051 for regular communications and (703) 308-9052 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,387
Art Unit: 2632

Page 6



DONNIE L. CROSLAND
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2632

Dlc
January 13, 2003